

Date Mailed
December 20, 2002

BEFORE THE
PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF WISCONSIN

Application of United States Cellular Corporation for Designation
as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in Wisconsin

8225-TI-102

FINAL DECISION

This is the final decision in this proceeding to determine whether to designate United States Cellular Corporation (US Cellular) as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier (ETC), pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(2) and Wis. Admin. Code § 160.13. Designation as an ETC makes a provider eligible to receive universal service fund (USF) monies.

Introduction

US Cellular filed an application for ETC designation in November 2001. Staff requested clarification of some parts of the application, and U.S. Cellular filed an amendment to the application on January 14, 2002. The Commission issued a Notice of Proceeding, Investigation and Assessment of Costs and Request for Comments on March 5, 2002. The applicant, and various parties to the docket, jointly submitted a request to delay the filing of comments to allow the applicant to respond to staff data requests and to allow the other parties an opportunity to review those responses. That request was granted. Parties filed comments on July 1, 2002, and reply comments on July 22, 2002. The Commission discussed this matter at its November 7, 2002 open meeting.

US Cellular requested ETC designation for the southern half of Wisconsin, plus the Door County Peninsula. The territories for which ETC designation is requested are served by Ameritech, Verizon and several rural telecommunications carriers.

Findings of Fact

1. The wireless industry, its customary practices, its usual customer base and US Cellular's desire not to obtain state USF money create an unusual situation.
2. It is reasonable to adopt different ETC eligibility requirements and obligations for US Cellular.
3. It is reasonable to require US Cellular to meet only the federal requirements for ETC status in order to be eligible for ETC designation.
4. It is reasonable to relieve US Cellular from ETC obligations other than those imposed under federal law.
5. It is reasonable to require that US Cellular not apply for state USF funds and that if it ever does, all state requirements for and obligations of ETC status shall again be applicable to it.
6. US Cellular meets the federal requirements for ETC designation.
7. It is in the public interest to designate US Cellular as an ETC in certain areas served by rural telephone companies.
8. It is reasonable to grant US Cellular ETC status in the non-rural wire centers indicated in its application, to the extent that the wire centers are located within the state.
9. It is reasonable to grant US Cellular ETC status in the areas for which it has requested such designation where the request includes the entire territory of a rural telephone company, to the extent such areas are located within the state.
10. It is reasonable to grant US Cellular ETC status in the areas for which it has requested such designation where the request does not include the entire territory of a rural

telephone company, to the extent the areas are located within the state, conditioned upon the FCC approving the use of the smaller areas.

Conclusions of Law

The Commission has jurisdiction and authority under Wis. Stats. §§ 196.02, 196.218 and 196.395 Wis. Admin. Code ch. 160, 47 U.S.C. §§ 214, 254, and other pertinent provisions of the Telecommunications Act of 1996, to make the above Findings of Fact and to issue this Order.

Opinion

ETC status was created by the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC"), and codified in 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(2). Under FCC rules, the state commissions are required to designate providers as ETCs. 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(2), 47 C.F.R. § 54.201(b). Designation as an ETC is required if a provider is to receive federal universal service funding. ETC designation is also required to receive funding from some, but not all, state universal service programs.

The FCC established a set of minimum criteria that all ETCs must meet. These are codified in the federal rules. 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(1), 47 C.F.R. § 54.101(a). The 1996 Telecommunications Act states that "States may adopt regulations not inconsistent with the Commission's rules to preserve and advance universal service." 47 U.S.C § 254(f). A court upheld the states' right to impose additional conditions on ETCs in *Texas Office of Public Utility Counsel v. FCC*, 183 F.3d 393, 418 (5th Cir. 1999). While states must designate multiple ETCs if more than one provider meets the requirements and requests that status in a non-rural area, it must determine that it is in the public interest before designating more than one ETC in a rural area. 47 C.F.R. § 54.201. The Commission has already designated one ETC in each rural area.

In the year 2000, the Commission promulgated rules covering ETC designations and requirements in Wisconsin. Wis. Admin. Code § PSC 160.13. Those rules govern the process

for ETC designation and set forth a minimum set of requirements for providers seeking ETC designation from the Commission. The application filed by US Cellular asks that it be designated as an ETC for federal purposes only. It states that it is not seeking designation as an ETC for state purposes and, therefore, is not required to meet the additional state requirements.

States must examine the federal requirements, but are allowed to create additional requirements. Wisconsin has done so. The Commission's requirements for ETC designation clarify and expand upon the more basic FCC rules. There is no provision in the rule for designation as an ETC for federal purposes only. If a provider seeks to be designated as an ETC, it must follow the procedures and requirements in Wis. Admin. Code § PSC 160.13 and, if such a designation is granted, that designation serves to qualify the provider for both state and federal universal service funding. However, Wis. Admin. Code § 160.01(2)(b) provides that:

Nothing in this chapter shall preclude special and individual consideration being given to exceptional or unusual situations and upon due investigation of the facts and circumstances involved, the adoption of requirements as to individual providers or services that may be lesser, greater, other or different than those provided in this chapter.

US Cellular's request for ETC status presents an unusual situation. The wireless industry, its customary practices, and its usual customer base are quite different than those of wireline companies. Additionally, US Cellular has stated that it has no desire to obtain state USF money. The Commission finds that under the particular circumstances of this case, it is reasonable to adopt different ETC requirements for US Cellular to meet, and to grant ETC status to US Cellular with certain limitations.

Because US Cellular only wishes to obtain federal USF support, the Commission shall adopt the federal requirements for ETC status as the requirements that US Cellular must meet to obtain ETC status. The federal requirements are found in 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(1), 47 C.F.R.

§§ 54.101(a), 54.405 and 54.411. Further, the Commission relieves US Cellular from ETC obligations other than those imposed under federal law. However, since US Cellular will not be subject to the state requirements and state obligations, the Commission requires that US Cellular not apply for state USF money. If US Cellular ever does apply for state USF money, then all of the state requirements for and obligations of ETC status shall again be applicable to US Cellular.¹

The Commission finds that US Cellular has met the requirements for ETC designation; it will offer supported service to all customers in its designation areas and will advertise these services. In the FCC Declaratory Ruling *In the Matter of Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, Western Wireless Corporation Petition for Preemption of an Order of the South Dakota Public Utilities Commission*, FCC 00-248 (released 8/10/00), par. 24 (South Dakota Decision) the FCC has stated:

A new entrant can make a reasonable demonstration to the state commission of its capability and commitment to provide universal service without the actual provision of the proposed service. There are several possible methods for doing so, including, but not limited to: (1) a description of the proposed service technology, as supported by appropriate submissions; (2) a demonstration of the extent to which the carrier may otherwise be providing telecommunications services within the state; (3) a description of the extent to which the carrier has entered into interconnection and resale agreements; or, (4) a sworn affidavit signed by a representative of the carrier to ensure compliance with the obligation to offer and advertise the supported services.

If this is sufficient for a new entrant, it would seem to be even more so for someone who has already started to serve portions of the exchanges. US Cellular submitted an affidavit ensuring compliance and, as mentioned earlier, is not only providing service in other areas of the state but also in parts of the areas for which it has requested ETC status.

¹ Thus, for example, while US Cellular must offer a federally acceptable Lifeline program, it can only request Lifeline USF support at the federal level.

The Commission finds that US Cellular meets the requirement to offer service to all requesting customers. It has stated in its application and comments that it will do so. It has submitted an affidavit to this effect with its application. Much was made of US Cellular's language stating that it will make "commercially reasonable" efforts to improve coverage and will expand service if it is "economically reasonable" to do so. Many commenters argued that this shows that the applicant will not meet the same standard that is applied to wireline providers. However, this is a case where "the devil is in the details." It is true that the purpose of universal service programs is to ensure that customers who might not otherwise be served at affordable rates by a competitive market still receive service. However, like for wireline companies, access to high cost assistance is what helps ensure that service is provided. For US Cellular, access to high cost assistance is exactly what will make expanding service to customers requesting service in the areas for which it is designated as an ETC "commercially reasonable" or "economically feasible". As the FCC has said:

A new entrant, once designated as an ETC, is required, as the incumbent is required, to extend its network to serve new customers upon reasonable request. South Dakota Decision, par. 17.

US Cellular, like wireline ETCs, must fulfill this mandate, and access to high cost funding is what will help make doing so possible. The issue of "dead spots" is not significantly different from a LEC ETC that does not have its own lines in a portion of an exchange, perhaps a newly developed area. After obtaining a reasonable request for service, the LEC is required to find a way to offer service, either through extending its own facilities or other options. So too, US

Cellular must be given a reasonable opportunity to provide service to requesting customers, whether through expansion of its own facilities or some other method.²

US Cellular has also stated in its affidavit, application and comments that it will advertise the designated services as required under 47 U.S.C. § 214(e)(1)(B), including the availability of low income programs.

Other objections to US Cellular's designation focus on an alleged inability to meet certain additional state requirements in Wis. Admin. Code § PSC 160.13. These are moot, however, since the Commission has adopted different requirements for US Cellular.

Some of the exchanges for which US Cellular seeks ETC status are served by non-rural ILECs Ameritech and Verizon. Under Wis. Admin. Code § 160.13(3) and 47 U.S.C. § 251(e)(2), the Commission must designate multiple ETCs in areas served by such non-rural companies. However, the Commission may only designate multiple ETCs in an area served by a rural company if designating more than one ETC is in the public interest. Some of the exchanges for which US Cellular seeks ETC status are served by rural telephone companies.

The Commission finds that designating US Cellular as an additional ETC in these areas is in the public interest. In its determination, the Commission is guided by the Wis. Stat. §196.03(6) factors to consider when making a public interest determination:

- (a) Promotion and preservation of competition consistent with ch. 133 http://folio.legis.state.wi.us/cgi-bin/om_isapi.dll?clientID=83671&infobase=stats.nfo&jump=ch.%20133&softpage=Document - JUMPDEST_ch. 133 and s. 196.219. http://folio.legis.state.wi.us/cgi-bin/om_isapi.dll?clientID=83671&infobase=stats.nfo&jump=196.219&softpage=Document - JUMPDEST_196.219
- (b) Promotion of consumer choice.
- (c) Impact on the quality of life for the public, including privacy

² US Cellular mentions meeting this requirement through use of its own facilities, use of unbundled network elements and/or resale. If it plans to resell wireline service it will, of course, have to apply to this Commission for certification as a reseller or competitive local exchange carrier.

- considerations.
- (d) Promotion of universal service.
- (e) Promotion of economic development, including telecommunications infrastructure deployment.
- (f) Promotion of efficiency and productivity.
- (g) Promotion of telecommunications services in geographical areas with diverse income or racial populations.

The Commission finds that designating US Cellular as an ETC in areas served by rural companies will increase competition in those areas and, so, will increase consumer choice. While it is true that US Cellular is currently serving in at least some of these areas, the availability of high cost support for infrastructure deployment will allow US Cellular to expand its availability in these areas. Further, designation of another ETC may spur ILEC infrastructure deployment and encourage further efficiencies and productivity gains. Additional infrastructure deployment, additional consumer choices, the effects of competition, the provision of new technologies, a mobility option and increased local calling areas will benefit consumers and improve the quality of life for affected citizens of Wisconsin. As a result, the Commission finds that it is in the public interest to designate US Cellular as an ETC in the areas served by rural telephone companies for which it has requested such designation.

The areas for which US Cellular is granted ETC status vary. Wis. Admin. Code § 160.13(2) states that the areas in which a provider shall be designated as an ETC depend on the nature of the ILEC serving that area. If the ILEC is a non-rural telephone company, the designation area is the ILEC's wire center. The FCC has urged states not to require that competitive ETCs be required to offer service in the entire territory of large ILECs. It has found that such a requirement could be a barrier to entry. *Report and Order in the Matter of Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service*, FCC 97-157 (released 5/8/97) pars. 176-177 (First Report and Order). Wisconsin's rule provision resolves this federal concern. As a result, US

Cellular is granted ETC status in the Ameritech and Verizon wire centers for which it requested such status, to the extent that such wire centers are located within the state.

Wis. Admin. Code § 160.13(2) provides that if the ILEC is a rural telephone company the ETC designation area is different. For an area served by a rural telephone company, the designation area is generally the entire territory (study area) of that rural company. A smaller designation area is prohibited unless the Commission designates and the FCC approves a smaller area. 47 C.F.R. § 54.207(b). US Cellular's application contained a list of rural telephone company areas for which it requested ETC status. The list contained a number of inaccuracies which make determining whether it is seeking that status in the entire territory of some non-rural companies difficult. The Commission has prepared an attachment showing the rural areas for which it believes US Cellular is seeking ETC status. If this list is not accurate, US Cellular is ordered to submit to the Commission a revised list, in the same format as the attachment to this order, by January 2, 2003.

The Commission also grants ETC status to US Cellular in the areas for which it is seeking designation for the entire territory of a rural telephone company, to the extent that such exchanges are located within the state. Finally, where US Cellular is asking for ETC designation in some, but not all, parts of the territory of a rural telephone company, the Commission conditionally grants ETC status in the areas for which US Cellular has requested such designation, to the extent that such exchanges are located within the state. However, US Cellular must apply to the FCC for approval of the use of a smaller area in such a designation. 47 C.F.R. § 54.207(c)(1). If the FCC approves use of the smaller area, then US Cellular's ETC status for the smaller area(s) becomes effective. If the FCC does not approve use of the smaller area(s), then US Cellular's conditional ETC status for such an area is void. In such a case, if US Cellular

determines that it then wants to apply for ETC status in the entire territory of the rural company, it may submit a new application requesting such designation.

The Commission grants this conditional status after having considered the changing market and the reason why the limitations on ETC designation in rural areas was created. Originally there were concerns about “cherry picking” or “cream skimming.” At that time the USF support was averaged across all lines served by a provider within its study area. The per line support was the same throughout the study area. The concern was that competitive companies might ask for ETC designation in the parts of a rural company’s territory that cost less to serve. It could thereby receive the averaged federal high cost assistance while only serving the low cost areas of the territory, while the ILEC received federal high cost assistance but had to serve the entire territory, including the high cost areas. First Report and Order, par. 189. As a result, the FCC found that, unless otherwise approved by both the state and the FCC, a competitor seeking ETC status in the territory of a rural company must commit to serving the entire territory. First Report and Order, par. 189.

However, since that time the USF funding mechanisms have changed. Currently, a competitive ETC gets the same amount of federal high cost assistance per line as the ILEC. An ILEC has the option to target the federal high cost assistance it receives so that it receives more USF money per line in the parts of the territory where it costs more to provide service, and less federal USF money in the parts of the territory where it costs less to provide service. *In the Matter of Multi-Association Group (MAG) Plan*, FCC 01-157 (released 5/23/01), par. 147. (MAG Order) Since the competitive ETC receives the same per line amount as the ILEC, if it chooses to only serve the lower cost parts of the territory then it receives only the lower amount of federal USF money. As a result, as recognized by the FCC, the concerns about “cherry

picking” and “cream skimming” are largely moot. *In the Matter of Reconsideration of Western Wireless Corporation’s Designation as an Eligible Telecommunications Carrier in the State of Wyoming*, FCC 01-311 (released 10/16/01), par. 12.

In the MAG Order, rural telephone companies were given the opportunity to choose a disaggregation and targeting method or to not disaggregate and target USF support. MAG Order, pars. 147-154. Companies were allowed to choose one of three targeting paths. Some of the companies in whose territory US Cellular is seeking ETC designation chose Path One (no targeting) and some chose Path Three (targeting). If a competitive ETC is named in all or part of the service territory of a rural company, that company may ask the Commission to allow it to choose another Path. The FCC believed that state involvement in path changes gave competitors some certainty as to the amount of per line support available while preventing a rural company from choosing or moving to a different path for anti-competitive reasons. MAG Order, par. 153. Some of the companies in whose territory US Cellular is seeking ETC designation have disaggregated and targeted USF support, and some have not. However, the Commission may allow a company to change paths when a competitive ETC is designated in a rural company’s territory.

Order

1. US Cellular is granted ETC status in the non-rural wire centers indicated in its application, to the extent the wire centers are located within the state.
2. US Cellular is granted Cellular ETC status in the areas for which it has requested such designation where the request includes the entire territory of a rural telephone company, to the extent the areas are located within the state.

3. US Cellular is granted ETC status in the areas for which it has requested such designation where the request does not include the entire territory of a rural telephone company, to the extent the areas are located within the state, conditioned upon the FCC approving the use of the smaller areas.

4. US Cellular shall file a revised list of rural areas for which it is seeking ETC status by January 2, 2003 if the list attached to this order is inaccurate. The revised list shall use the same format as the attachment.

5. US Cellular must request that the FCC approve the use of an area smaller than the entire territory of certain rural telephone companies (listed in an attachment to this order) when granting ETC status in those areas.

6. If the FCC does not approve the use of areas smaller than the entire territory of a rural telephone company when granting ETC status in those areas, then the conditional grant of ETC status in this order is void.

7. US Cellular shall not apply for state USF support. If it ever does file for such support the state eligibility requirements for and obligations of ETC status shall immediately apply to it.

8. Jurisdiction is maintained.

Dated at Madison, Wisconsin, _____

By the Commission:

Lynda L. Dorr
Secretary to the Commission

PRJ:g:\order\pending\8225-TI-102
See attached Notice of Appeal Rights

Notice of Appeal Rights

Notice is hereby given that a person aggrieved by the foregoing decision has the right to file a petition for judicial review as provided in Wis. Stat. § 227.53. The petition must be filed within 30 days after the date of mailing of this decision. That date is shown on the first page. If there is no date on the first page, the date of mailing is shown immediately above the signature line. The Public Service Commission of Wisconsin must be named as respondent in the petition for judicial review.

Notice is further given that, if the foregoing decision is an order following a proceeding which is a contested case as defined in Wis. Stat. § 227.01(3), a person aggrieved by the order has the further right to file one petition for rehearing as provided in Wis. Stat. § 227.49. The petition must be filed within 20 days of the date of mailing of this decision.

If this decision is an order after rehearing, a person aggrieved who wishes to appeal must seek judicial review rather than rehearing. A second petition for rehearing is not an option.

This general notice is for the purpose of ensuring compliance with Wis. Stat. § 227.48(2), and does not constitute a conclusion or admission that any particular party or person is necessarily aggrieved or that any particular decision or order is final or judicially reviewable.

Revised 9/28/98

APPENDIX A

This proceeding is not a contested case under Wis. Stat. Ch. 227, therefore there are no parties to be listed or certified under Wis. Stat. § 227.47. However, an investigation was conducted and the persons listed below participated.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION OF WISCONSIN
(Not a party, but must be served)
610 North Whitney Way
P.O. Box 7854
Madison, WI 53707-7854

MS STEPHANIE L MOTT ATTY
REINHART BOERNER VAN DEUREN
PO BOX 2018
MADISON WI 53701-2018

MR NICK LESTER
WSTA
6602 NORMANDY LN
MADISON WI 53719

MR BRUCE C REUBER
INTERSTATE TELCOM CONSULTING INC
PO BOX 668
HECTOR MN 55342-0668

MR CHARLES A HOFFMAN
MASLON EDELMAN BORNER BRAND LLP
90 S SEVENTH ST #3300
MINNEAPOLIS MN 55402-4140

MR LARRY L LUECK
NSIGHT TELSERVICES/NORTHEAST TEL CO
PO BOX 19079
GREEN BAY WI 54307-9079

Docket 8225-TI-102

MR JUDD A GENDA ATTY
AXLEY BRYNELSON LLP
2 E MIFFLIN ST STE 200
MADISON WI 53703

MS LISA VOLPE
AT&T WIRELESS
1150 CONNECTICUT AVE NW 4TH FL
WASHINGTON DC 20036

APPENDIX B**Exchanges Served by Rural Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers
for which ETC Status was Requested**

Rural Incumbent LEC	Exchanges for which ETC Status WAS Requested	Exchanges for which ETC Status WAS NOT Requested
Amherst Telephone Company	Amherst, Custer, Rosholt,	(none)
Belmont Telephone Co.	Belmont	(none)
Bergen Telephone Co.	Bergen	(none)
Black Earth Telephone Co.	Black Earth	(none)
Burlington, Brighton and Wheatland Tel. Co.	Bohners Lake, Wheatland	(none)
Central State Telephone Co.	Auburndale, Junction City, Lindsey, Necedah, Pittsville, Vesper,	Cranmoor, Mill Creek
CenturyTel of Fairwater Brandon Alto, LLC (1910)	Brandon	(none)
CenturyTel of Forestville, LLC (2050)	Brussels, Forestville, Little Sturgeon	(none)
CenturyTel of Central Wisconsin, LLC (2055)	Alma Center, Arcadia, Argyle, Bangor, Black Creek, Black River Falls, Benton ^{CC} , Blair, Centerville, Darlington, Denmark, Ettrick, Fairchild, Fountain City, Galesville, Gratiot, Holmen, Hixton, Kingston, Luxemburg, Markesan, Melrose, Merrilan, Mindoro, Montfort, Muscoda, New Franklin, Nichols, Osseo, Pickett, Rosendale, Seymour, Shiocton, Shullsburg, Taylot, Trempealeau, Wautoma, Whitehall, Wiota	Augusta, Cleghorn, Fall Creek

Rural Incumbent LEC	Exchanges for which ETC Status WAS Requested	Exchanges for which ETC Status WAS NOT Requested
CenturyTel of the Midwest – Kendall, LLC (2815)	Baraboo, Berlin, Green Lake, Kendall, Mazomanie, North Freedom, Princeton, Red Granite	Ashland, Bayfield, Cornell, Hurley, Saxon, Ladysmith, Marinette, McAllister, Oconto, Oconto Falls, Peshtigo, Stanley, John, Pattison, Washburn
CenturyTel of Monroe County, LLC (3810)	Cashton, Cataract, Norwalk, Ontario, Sparta, Wilton	(none)
CenturyTel of Larsen-Readfield, LLC (3070)	Larsen, Readfield	(none)
CenturyTel of Southern Wisconsin, LLC (4590)	Cambria, Fall River, Fox Lake, Rio, Randolph	(none)
CenturyTel of the Midwest – Wisconsin, LLC (4260)	Avoca, Boscobel, Casco ^C , DeForest, Delafield, Dousman, Eagle, East Troy, Footville ^W , Fremont ^{CM} , Genesee, Hazel Green ^P , Highland, Milton ^{CM} , Mt. Zion, Mukwanago, Neskoro, North Prairie, Platteville ^P , Poynette, Poysippi ^{CM} , Ripon, Steuben, Sullivan, Tomah, Warrens, Wayside ^W , Weyawega ^C , Wild Rose, Wonewoc	Amberg, Boyd, Cadott, Chetek, Coleman, Crivitz, Cumberland, , Goodman, Harmony, Lena, Pembine, Sarona, Shell Lake, Spooner, Thorp, Turtle Lake, Twin Bridge, Wausaukee
CenturyTel of Wisconsin, LLC (2930)	Onalaska, LaCrosse, West Salem,	(none)
Citizen's Telecommunications Company, of Illinois	East Dubuque	Fairplay
Cochrane Cooperative Telephone Company	Chochrane, Waumandee	(none)
Coon Valley Farmers Telephone Company	Coon Valley, Chaseburg, Stoddard	(none)
Cuba City Telephone Company	Cuba City	(none)
Dickeyville Telephone Company	Dickeyville	(none)

Rural Incumbent LEC	Exchanges for which ETC Status WAS Requested	Exchanges for which ETC Status WAS NOT Requested
EastCoast Telecom, Inc.	Cleveland, Collins, Howard's Grove, St. Nazianz, Valders	(none)
Farmers Telephone Co.	Beetown, Cassville, Lancaster, Potosi	(none)
Frontier Communications of Mondovi, Inc.	Mondovi	(none)
Frontier Communications of Wisconsin, Inc.	Bear Creek, Clintonville, Marion, Tigerton	Bowler, Cecil, Gresham, Keshena, Neopit, Shawno
Frontier Communicaitons of Viroqua, Inc.	Viroqua	(none)
Grantland Telecom, Inc.	Bagley, Bloomington, Fennimore, Mount Hope, Woodman,	(none)
Hillsboro Telephone Co.	Hillsboro	(none)
La Valle Telephone Cooperative, Inc.	Cazenovia, La Valle	(none)
Lakefield Telephone Company	Newton, Newtonburg	(none)
Lemonweir Valley Telephone Co.	Camp Douglas, New Lisbon	(none)
Manawa Telephone Company	Manawa, Ogdensburg	(none)
Marquette-Adams Telephone Cooperative, Inc.	Brooks, Endevor, Oxford, Packwaukee,	Easton, FCI, Jordan Lake,
Mid-Plains Telephone, Inc.	Cross Plains, Middleton	(none)
Mt. Horeb Telephone Co.	Mt. Horeb	(none)
Mt. Vernon Telephone Co.	Mt. Vernon, New Glarus, Verona	(none)
Nelson Telephone Cooperative	Durand, Gilmanton, Nelson	Arkansaw
Northeast Telephone Co.	Mill Center, Pulaski, Oneida	Krakow
Richland Grant Telephone Coop., Inc.	Blue River, Boaz, Gays Mills, Sabin, Soldier's Grove	(none)
Riverside Telcon, Inc.	Johnson Creek, Reeseville	(none)
Scandinavia Telephone Co.	Iola, Scandinavia	(none)

Rural Incumbent LEC	Exchanges for which ETC Status WAS Requested	Exchanges for which ETC Status WAS NOT Requested
Sharon Telephopne Co.	Sharon	(none)
Southeast Telephone Co.	Waterford, Wind Lake	(none)
State Long Distance Telephone Co.	Elkhorn	Lauderdale
Stockbridge & Sherwood Telephone Co.	Hilbert, Stockbridge, Tisch Mills	Sherwood
Telephone USA of Wisconsin, LLC	Eastman, Prarie Du Chein, Seneca, Wauzeka	Balsam Lake, Barrow, Birchwood, Boyceville, Butternut, Centuria, Colfax, Elk Mound, Elmwood, Gillett, Glenwood City, Glidden, Hayward, Knapp, Lakewood, Laona, Maiden Rock, Mellen, Park Falls, Pepin, Plum City, Prescott, Rice Lake, Saint Croix Falls, Spider Lake, Springbrook, Stone Lake, Suring, Wabeno, Wheeler, Winter.
Tenney Telephone Company	Alma	(none)
Tri-County Telephone Cooperative, Inc.	Eleva, Independence, Northfield, Pigeon Falls, Pleasantville, Strum	(none)
Union Telephone Co.	Almond, Coloma, Hancock, Plainfield	(none)
UTELCO, Inc.	Albany, Blanchardville, Browntown, Juda, Monticello, Monroe, South Wayne, Woodford	(none)
Vernon Telephone Cooperative	Desoto, Genoa, La Farge, Liberty Pole, Readstown, Viola, Westby, Yuba	(none)
Waunakee Telephone Co.	Waunakee	(none)
Wood County Telephone Co.	Nekoosa, Port Edwards, Rudolph, Wisconsin Rapids	

^c In it's application, US Cellular incorrectly identified this exchange as being served by CenturyTel of the Midwest – Wisconsin – Casco.

^N In it's application, US Cellular incorrectly identified this exchange as being served by CenturyTel of the Midwest – Wisconsin, Inc. – Northwest.

^W In it's application, US Cellular incorrectly identified this exchange as being served by CenturyTel of the Midwest – Wisconsin – Wayside.

^P In it's application, US Cellular incorrectly identified this exchange as being served by CenturyTel of the Midwest – Wisconsin – Platteville.

^{CM} In it's application, US Cellular incorrectly identified this exchange as being served by CenturyTel of the Midwest – Wisconsin – CENCOM. Poysippi was identified as Pine Riv (sic).

**Wire Centers Served by Non-rural Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers
for which ETC Status was Requested**

Wire Centers served by SBC Ameritech:

<u>DOMSWITCH</u>	<u>CITY</u>	<u>DOMSWITCH</u>	<u>CITY</u>
ALGMWII1RSO	ALGOMA	HOVLWI12RSO	HORTONVILLE
APPLWIO1DSO	APPLETON	HRCNWI11RSO	HORICON
BELTWIO1DSO	BELOIT	HRFRWI11RSO	HARTFORD
BFTWWI11RS1	WAUKESHA	HRLDWI11DSA	HARTLAND
BGBNWI11RSO	BIG BEND	JCSNWI11DSA	JACKSON
BRFDWI11RS3	BROOKFIELD	JFSNWI11RSO	JEFFERSON
BURL WI 11RSO	BURLINGTON	JNVLWIO1DSA	JANESVILLE
BVDMWIO1DSA	BEAVER DAM	JUNEWI11RSO	JUNEAU
CDBGWI15DSA	CEDARBURG	KAUKWI11RSO	KAUKAUNA
CLDNWI14RSO	CALEDONIA	KENOWIO1DSO	KENOSHA
CLMBWI11RSO	COLUMBUS	KENOWI11DSA	KENOSHA
DEPRWI11DSO	DE PERE	KEWNWI11RSO	KEWAUNEE
DLVNWII1RSO	DELAVAN	LCHTWI11RSO	LITTLE CHUTE
EVVL WI 11 RSO	EVANSVILLE	LKGNWIO1DSO	LAKE GENEVA
FDULWIO1DSO	FOND DU LAC	MDSNWI11DSO	MADISON
FTATWI11RSO	FTATKINSON	MDSNWI12DSO	MADISON
GNBYWIO1DS1	GREEN BAY	MDSNWI13DSO	MADISON
GNBYWI11DSA	GREEN BAY	MDSNWI14DSO	MADISON
GNBYWI12DSO	GREEN BAY	MDSNWI15DSA	MADISON
GNBYWI13DSO	GREEN BAY	MDSNWI16DSO	MADISON
GNCYWI12RSO	GENOA CITY	MILWWI10DSA	MILWAUKEE
GNVLWI12RSO	GREENVILLE	MILWWI12DS2	MILWAUKEE
HBTSWI11DSO	HUBERTUS	MILWWI13DS1	MILWAUKEE

MILWWI6DSO	MILWAUKEE	PEWKWIIIRSI	WAUKESHA
MILWWI7DSO	MILWAUKEE	PEWKWI40DSO	PEW AUKEE
MILWWI22DSO	MILWAUKEE	PLPRWIIIRSO	PLEASANTPR
MILWWI23DSO	MILWAUKEE	PRSDWIIIDSO ;	KENOSHA
MIL WWI25DSO	HALES CORNERS	PTW A WIIIRSO	PRT WASHINGTON
MIL WWI27DSO	MILWAUKEE	RACNWIOIDSO	RACINE
MIL WWI28DSA	MILWAUKEE	RACNWIIIDSA	RACINE
MILWWI30DSO	MILWAUKEE	RCMDWIIIRSO	RICHMOND
MILWWI31DSO	MENOMONEE	SGTNWIIIDSO	STOUGHTON
FALLS		SHBYWIO1DSO	SHEBOYGAN
MILWWI34DSI	MILWAUKEE	SHFLWI12DSO	SHEBOYGAN FLS
MILWWI38RSI	MILWAUKEE	SMRSWIIIRSO	KENOSHA
MILWWI42DSO	MILWAUKEE	STBYWIIIRSO	STURGEON BAY
MILWWI45DSI	BROOKFIELD	STPTWIO1DSO	STEVENS PT
MILWWI48DSA	MILWAUKEE	STRTWIIIDSO	STURTEVANT
MIL WWI56DSO	OAK CREEK	SUSXWI46D~1	SUSSEX
MNFLWI32DSA	MENOMONEE	UNGVWIIIRSO	UNION GROVE
FALLS		VNDNWIIIRSI	VAN DYNE
MNTWWIOIDSO	MANITOWOC	WAPNWIIIRSO	WAUPUN
MSKGWI36DSA	MUSKEGO	WBNDWIO1DSO	WEST BEND
MYVLWIIIRSO	MAYVILLE	WHWRWIIIDSO	WHITEWATER
NENHWIIIDSO	NEENAH	WKSHWI47DSA	WAUKESHA
NWBGWIIIRSO	NEWBURG	WMBYWIIIDSA	WILLIAMS BAY
NWLNWIIIRSO	NEW LONDON	WNCNWIIIDSO	WINNECONNE
OCNMWIIIDSO	OCONOMOWOC	WPCAWIIIDSO	WAUPACA
OMROWIIIDSO	OMRO	WRTWWI1IRSO	WRIGHTSTOWN
OSHKWIO1DSA	OSHKOSH	WTTWWI01DSA	WATERTOWN

Wire Centers served by Verizon:

<u>DOMSWITCH</u>	<u>CITY</u>	<u>DOMSWITCH</u>	<u>CITY</u>
APRVILXARSO	APPLE RIVER	BRKL WIXBRSO	BROOKLYN
WRRNILXARSO	WARREN	BRSTWIXADSO	BRISTOL
ADMSWIXARSO	ADAMS	CDGVWIXARSO	CEDAR GROVE
ALNTWIXARSO	ALLETON	CITNWIXARSO	CHILTON
ARENWIXARS3	ARENA	CLTNWIXADSO	CLINTON
BLCYWIXARSI	BLOOM CITY	CLYMWIXARLO	JUNEAU
BLGMWIXARSO	BELGIUM	CMBRWIXARSO	CAMBRIDGE
BLHRWIXARSO	BAILEY HARBOR	CMPTWIXARSO	CAMPBELLSPORT
BLLNWIXARSO	BRILLION	COBBWIXARSO	COBB
BLVLWIXARSO	BELLEVILLE	CSCDWIXARSO	CASCADE
BRGVWIXARSO	BRIGGSVILLE	CTGVWIXADSO	COTTAGE GROVE
BRHDWIXADSO	BRODHEAD	DARNWIXADS2	DARIEN

DGVL WIXADSO	DODGEVILLE	NWHLWIXARSO	NEW HOLSTEIN
DRFDWIXARS 1	DEERFIELD	OKFDWIXADSO	OAKFIELD
EDENW1XARS4	EDEN	ORGNWIXADSO	OR
EGHRWIXARSO	EGG HARBOR	ORVLWIXADSO	ORFORDVILLE
EGTNWIXADSO	EDGERTON	OSBGWIARSO	OOSTBURG
ELLKWIXARSO	ELKHART LK	PDVLWIXARSO	PARDEEVILLE
GNBSWIXARSO	GREENBUSH	PLANWIXARS3	PLAIN
HLBRWIXARSO	HILBERT	PLMOWIXADSO	PLYMOUTH
HODL WIXARSO	HOLLANDALE	PRTGWIXADSO	PORTAGE
HSFDWIXARSO	HUSTISFORD	RCCTWIXADSO	RICHLAND CTR
ITHCWIXARSO	ITHACA	RDBGWIXADSO	REEDSBURG
JCPTWIXARLO	JACKSONPORT	RDVL WIXARSO	REEDSVILLE
JHBGWIXARSO	JOHNSBURG	RDWYWIXARSO	RIDGEWAY
KIEL WIXARSO	KIEL	RNLKWIXADSO	RANDOM LK
KWSKWIXARS2	KEWASKUM	SALMWIXARSO	SALEM
LBNNW1XARL	LEBANON	SKCYWIXADSO	SAUK CITY
LGVL WIXARSO	LOGANVILLE	SLLKWIXARSO	SILVER LAKE
LKML WIXADSO	LAKE MILLS	SLNGWIXADSO	SLINGER
LMRGWIXARSO	LIME RIDGE	SNPRWIXADSO	SUN PRAIRIE
LNRKWIXARSO	LONE ROCK	SPGRWIXADSO	SPRING GREEN
LODIWIXARSO	LODI	SSBYWIXADSO	SISTER BAY
LOMRWIXARS6	LOMIRA (DODGE)	STCDWIXARSO	ST CLOUD
LYSTWIXARLO	LYNDON STA	THRSWIXARS4	THERESA
MCF A WIXADSO	MC F ARLAND	TRVRWIXARSO	TREVOR .
MNCTWIXARSI	ARKDALE	TWLKWIXARSO	TWIN LAKES .
MNPTWIXARSO	MINERAL PT	TWRVWIXADSO	TWO RIVERS.
MPTNWIXARSO	OCONOMOWOC	WAISWIXARSO	WASHINGTON IS
MRFDWIXADSO	MARSHFIELD	WBKAWIXARSO	FREDONIA
MRMCWIXARSO	MERRIMAC	WHLWWIXARSO	WHITELAW
MRSHWIXARSO	MARSHALL	WIDLWIXADSO	WI DELLS
MSHCWIXARSO	MISSICOT	WLWOWIXADSO	WALWORTH
MSTNWIXADSI	MAUSTON	WSFDWIXARSO	WESTFIELD
MTCLWIXARSO	MOUNT CALVARY	WTRLWIXARSO	WATERLOO
MTLLWIXARSO	MONTELO	WTWNWIXARSO	WITWEN
NESHWIXARSO	NEOSHO		